

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-16 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-16 are rejected by the Examiner.
- Claims 1, 10, and 11 are amended by Applicant.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, and 6-15 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,873,080 to Coden et al. (Coden) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,832 to McGeorge, Jr. et al. (McGeorge). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Coden teaches a system that can input sub queries, each of which could be used for different media types to search a collection of multimedia documents in a database and produce a single combined result. (See Coden, Abstract, and col. 3, lines 33-36.)

Applicant amends Claim 1 to include the function of each cascaded analysis engine as: “each cascaded analysis engine serving to identify and extract portions of the input query to be compiled and executed on a particular execution engine serially cascaded with other search engines;”. (See amended Claim 1). Applicant finds support for the amendment in the as-filed specification in paragraph 0006 and Figure 3 of the as-filed specification. Applicant draws attention to the Figure 3 of the as-filed specification which indicates that the cascaded analysis engines 310, 320, and 330, server to extract portions of the input query 300. Those extracted portions are nested into compiled queries Compiled Query C 360, Compiled Query B 350 and Compiled Query A 340. Each of the analysis engines 310, 320, 330 having an associated Compiled Query 340, 350, and 360, and a respective serially cascaded Execution Engine 390, 380, and 370. The nested query is executed with the serially cascaded execution engines as shown in Figure 3.

The present Office Action dated 8/22/07 indicates, on page 2, that Coden contains serially cascaded “Analysis Engines” having the EUIS (120), the Query Interface (130), the

APIs (152, 154, and 156), and the search engines 162, 164, and 166). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The functional operations of Coden and Claim 1 differ in that the analysis engines of Claim 1 refer to the serially cascaded analysis engines of Figure 3. These analysis engines are serially cascaded (i.e. an actual “cascade” as shown in Figure 3 of the as-filed application, and not merely a flow from one function to another), and each of the serially cascaded engines inputs a representation of the entire input query, identifies and extracts a portion of the entire input query, and then each engine compiles the extracted portion and compiles that portion in a nested fashion. The compiled and nested query suitable for execution on serially cascaded search engines.

Applicant respectfully submits that Coden fails to teach serially cascaded search engines as in Claim 1 and Figure 3 of the pending application. The “analysis engines” of Coden are not serially cascaded such that each cascaded analysis engine serves to identify and extract portions of the input query to be compiled and executed on a particular execution engine, the search engines also serially cascaded.

Thus, Applicant submits that Coden does not teach serially cascaded analysis engines of the type claimed in amended Claim 1 and as shown in Figure 3 of the as-filed specification. Specifically, Coden fails to teach receiving an input query into a first analysis engine of serially cascaded analysis engines, where each cascaded analysis engine serves to identify and extract portions of the input query to be compiled and executed on a particular execution engine serially cascaded with other search engines as recited in amended Claim 1. The addition of McGeorge does not cure the deficiency of teaching in Coden. Thus, the combination of Coden and McGeorge fails to teach all claim elements of amended Claim 1. Although different in scope, independent Claims 10-11 are amended to include a similar definition of an analysis engine.

Since all of the elements of the amended independent claims are not taught by the combination of Coden and McGeorge, then the combination does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-16 because the claims patentably define over the cited art.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1743/303844.01
Application No.: 10/601,730
Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

PATENT

Claims 8 and 15 as well as 5 and 16 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,873,080 to Coden et al. (Coden) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,832 to McGeorge, Jr. et al. (McGeorge) and in further view of US Patent No. 6,697,799 to Neal et al. (Neal). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 8 and 15 and 5 and 16 are dependent on amended independent Claims 1 and 11. As discussed above, the combined teaching of Coden and McGeorge fail to render obvious the pending independent claims. The addition of Neal fails to cure the deficiency in the combined teaching. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 15 and 5 and 16 cannot be rendered obvious under the combination of Coden, McGeorge and Neil per MPEP §2143.03 because the combination fails to teach all claim limitations.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1743/303844.01
Application No.: 10/601,730
Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

PATENT

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims patentably define over the cited art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2007

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439